

Remarks

Claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18-25 are amended herein. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 102(e)

Claims 1-25

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Manachello et al. (6748439). Applicant has reviewed Manachello et al. and respectfully states that Manachello et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that Claims 1, 12 and 22 include the features “receiving a request for application services over an established network connection”. One example is a request for application service regarding video editing, content edition and enhancement. Another example is a request for application service regarding audio editing, copying and production. That is, the request for application services is not for a network connection or ISP provider, but is instead a request for an application service provider for the performance of an application service utilizing an application service routing server over an established network connection. These features are clearly shown throughout the specification including Figure 6 and Table A.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Manachello et al. anticipates the features of Claims 1, 12 and 22. Applicant understands Manachello et al. to teach a method for selecting a network service provider. That is, Applicant understands Manachello et al. to teach providing selection options to a user regarding the access provider to the Internet. Therefore, Applicant does not understand Manachello et al. to teach any application service routing servers such as services provided by applications over the Internet. Thus, Applicant understands Manachello et al. to teach a method for selecting the ISP or network

provider which may be a step performed prior to the inventive step of the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Manachello et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 12 and 22, and as such, Claims 1, 12 and 22 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Manachello et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-11 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 1, Claims 13-21 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 12 and Claims 23-25 which are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 22, and that Claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-25 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-25 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.


Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-25.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 11/16/04



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060